



United States Department of Agriculture  
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service  
Plant Protection and Quarantine



**Importation of Christmas Cactus, *Schlumbergera* spp.  
and Easter Cactus, *Rhipsalidopsis* spp.,  
In APHIS Approved Growing Media  
Into the United States, From The Netherlands**

Gary L. Cave, Ph.D., Entomologist  
Eileen Sutker, Ph.D., Ecologist

United States Department of Agriculture  
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service  
Plant Protection and Quarantine  
Center for Plant Health Science and Technology  
Plant Epidemiology and Risk Analysis Laboratory  
Raleigh, NC 27606

June 15, 2004

## Executive Summary

This pathway-initiated commodity risk analysis examines the risks associated with the proposed importation of Christmas and Easter cactus plants of *Schlumbergera* and *Rhipsalidopsis*, respectively, in APHIS-approved growing media, from The Netherlands into the United States. The quarantine pests that are likely to follow the pathway are analyzed using the methodology described in the USDA, APHIS, PPQ Guidelines version 5.02 which examines pest biology in the context of the Consequences of Introduction and Likelihoods of Introduction and estimates the Pest Risk Potential.

There is one quarantine pest, *sensu* FAO (2003) that can potentially follow the pathway on these plants: *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlechtend. f.sp. *opuntiarum* (Pettinari) Gordon (Fungi Imperfecti: Hyphomycetes). The organism *Fusarium oxysporum* occurs in the United States, and diagnoses at the production-system level are not made at the *formae speciales* level. The characteristic above-ground symptoms of cladophyll rot are relatively easy to identify and treat in the greenhouse. Use of clean stock and phytosanitary greenhouse production programs provides effective control for *Fusarium* diseases. For these reasons, *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *opuntiarum* is not analyzed as a unique quarantine pest for the purposes of this document.

The accompanying pest risk management section of this document considers the reduction of risk that will occur when existing regulations on the importation of plants in APHIS-approved growing media (7 CFR § 319.37-8) and proposed additional mitigation measures are applied to the importation of *Schlumbergera* and *Rhipsalidopsis* plants in growing media from The Netherlands. The use of the mitigation measures cited in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 7, Part 319, Subpart 37 (7 CFR § 319.37 - Nursery Stock, Plants, Roots, Bulbs, Seeds and Other Plant Products) is expected to substantially reduce the Likelihood of Introduction, and as such, the overall pest risk potential would be rated low because the known pests effectively are removed from the pathway.

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Risk Assessment .....	1
	A. Initiating Event: Proposed Action.....	1
	B. Assessment of Weed Potential of <i>Schlumbergera</i> and <i>Rhipsalidopsis</i> spp. ....	2
	C. Prior Risk Assessments, Current Status and Pest Interceptions.....	3
	D. Pest Categorization .....	3
III.	Phytosanitary Measures/Risk Management.....	7
IV.	Literature Cited .....	10

## **I. Introduction**

This pest risk analysis (PRA) was conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection and Quarantine, Center for Plant Health Science and Technology, Plant Epidemiology and Risk Analysis Laboratory (USDA, APHIS, PPQ, CPHST, PERAL) to examine the plant pest risks associated with the importation from The Netherlands, of Christmas Cactus (*Schlumbergera* spp.) and Easter Cactus (*Rhipsalidopsis* spp.) plants established in an APHIS-approved growing medium into the United States.

The methods used to initiate, conduct, and report this pest risk analysis and the use of biological and phytosanitary terms are consistent with international guidelines (FAO, 2002, 2003). The rating criteria used to categorize the potential biological severity of the impacts caused by exotic plant pests are found in the document: Pathway-Initiated Pest Risk Assessment: Guidelines for Qualitative Assessments, version.5.02 (USDA, 2000).

The authority for APHIS to regulate plant pests and plant products is derived from the Plant Protection Act of 2000 (7 USC §§ 7701 *et seq.*) and the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 7, Part 319, Subpart 37 (7 CFR § 319.37 - Nursery Stock, Plants, Roots, Bulbs, Seeds and Other Plant Products). The risk assessment methodology and rating criteria and the use of biological and phytosanitary terms is consistent with international guidelines (FAO, 2002, 2003) and current agency guidelines (USDA, 2000).

## **II. Risk Assessment**

### **A. Initiating Event: Proposed Action**

This commodity-based, pathway-initiated pest risk analysis was prepared in response to a request from the Government of The Netherlands to change current regulations to allow the importations of Christmas Cactus (*Schlumbergera* spp.) and Easter Cactus (*Rhipsalidopsis* spp.) plants established in seedling trays, in APHIS-approved growing media, or as bare-root plants with small amounts of APHIS-approved growing media attached to the roots. This is a potential pathway for the introduction of plant pests into the United States. These plants are currently permitted entry into the United States as bare-root plants under 7 CFR § 319.37 because plants free of media or without any attached growing media can be completely inspected. Generally, these plants are hybrids or asexually produced ornamentals that are not collected from the wild (Petersen, 2002).

Several European countries are currently exporting bare-root Cactaceae plants into the United States. In 1994, agricultural representatives of Belgium, Denmark, Israel and the Netherlands requested permission to export *Schlumbergera* spp. established in growing media to the United States. Currently, the importation of bare-root or unrooted cuttings of Cactaceae plants into the United States is subject to inspection and treatment, if warranted, at specially equipped

inspection stations as denoted in 7 CFR § 319.37-14. Importations must also be in accordance with the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES, 1998).

The USDA carefully assesses requests to change regulations related to propagative materials because the importation of propagative material in growing media raises unique phytosanitary concerns. Specifically, biological contaminants may not be discernible during pre-shipment and Port of Entry visual inspections. The inability to non-destructively inspect all parts of the plants (particularly roots) is likely to increase the potential for the introduction of exotic organisms. Treatment of growing media may not rid the media of organisms in the absence of specific guidelines, and the possibility of pest infestation/re-infestation of clean plants in the absence of specific safeguards exists.

## B. Assessment of Weed Potential of *Schlumbergera* and *Rhipsalidopsis* spp.

The determination of the potential weed threat posed by *Schlumbergera* and *Rhipsalidopsis* spp. or the existence of a previous characterization of these genera as weeds is documented in Table 1. The results of this weed screening for *Schlumbergera* and *Rhipsalidopsis* spp. did not prompt a pest-initiated risk assessment.

Table 1. Assessment of Weed Potential of <i>Schlumbergera</i> and <i>Rhipsalidopsis</i>	
<b>Commodities:</b> <i>Schlumbergera</i> Lemaire (Cactaceae), - Christmas cactus, Thanksgiving Cactus, Crab Cactus, Yoke Cactus and Claw Cactus (synonyms: <i>Epiphyllanthus</i> and <i>Zygocactus</i> ); <i>Rhipsalidopsis gaertneri</i> (Regel) Moran - Easter Cactus (synonyms: <i>Hatiora</i> , <i>Epiphyllum</i> and <i>Schlumbergera</i> )	
<b>Phase 1: Consider whether the genus is new to or not widely prevalent in the United States (exclude plants grown under USDA permit in approved containment facilities):</b> The genus <i>Schlumbergera</i> and <i>Rhipsalidopsis</i> consisting of epiphytic cacti native to Brazil, and are cultivated in the United States in interiorscapes, under glass and as houseplants. In the southern US, plants may be placed outdoors in planters or used in the landscape.	
<b>Phase 2: Is the species listed in:</b>	
<u>No</u>	Geographical Atlas of World Weeds (Holm <i>et al.</i> , 1979)
<u>No</u>	World's Worst Weeds (Holm <i>et al.</i> , 1977) or World Weeds: Natural Histories and Distribution (Holm <i>et al.</i> , 1997)
<u>No</u>	Report of the Technical Committee to Evaluate Noxious Weeds; Exotic Weeds for Federal Noxious Weed Act (Gunn and Ritchie, 1982)
<u>No</u>	Economically Important Foreign Weeds (Reed, 1977)
<u>No</u>	Weed Science Society of America list (WSSA, 2003)
<u>No</u>	Is there any literature reference indicating weediness, <i>e.g.</i> , AGRICOLA, CAB, Biological Abstracts, AGRIS
<b>Phase 3: Conclusion:</b>	
IF:	1. The species is widely prevalent in the United States and the answers to all of the questions are no - Proceed with the pest risk assessment.

### **C. Prior Risk Assessments, Current Status and Pest Interceptions**

There is a 1999 interception of one immature Pseudococcidae on permit cargo of *Schlumbergera* spp. imported into the United States from The Netherlands. This interception is identified only at the family level. Limits of the current taxonomic knowledge, the life stage, or the quality of the specimen, are reasons for incomplete identification. This immature may or may not belong to quarantine pest species, or it may belong to a non-quarantine species already addressed in the document. For this reason, this Pseudococcidae is not further analyzed in this document.

### **D. Pest Categorization**

There are two components to the definition of quarantine pest (FAO, 2002). First, a pest must be “of potential economic importance”, and, second, it must satisfy the geographic and regulatory criteria of “. . . not yet present there, or present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled.” Both quarantine and non-quarantine pests for the United States are enumerated in the following comprehensive list (Table 2). If none of the pests satisfy the criteria for classification as a quarantine pest, the risk assessment may stop (FAO, 2003).

Quarantine pests not expected to follow the pathway were not considered further. Information supporting the non-quarantine pest status is documented in the pest list or in the text. The decision not to analyze particular pests applies only to the current assessment. Pests may pose a different level of risk for the same commodity from a different country or from a different commodity from the same host plant genus. For example, their primary association may be with plant parts other than the commodity; their primary association was with the commodity, but it was not considered reasonable to expect these pests to remain with the commodity during processing; they were intercepted as biological contaminants of these commodities, during inspection by Plant Protection and Quarantine Officers and would not be expected to be present with every shipment.

A pest list for *Schlumbergera* and *Rhipsalidopsis* spp. is presented (Table 2). This list is not comprehensive for all pests of *Schlumbergera* and *Rhipsalidopsis* from all countries in Europe. The purpose is to identify some of the potential pests which may move into The Netherlands from other European countries on *Schlumbergera* and *Rhipsalidopsis* plants moving under the European Community Plant Passport System. The information in the Table includes the: scientific name of the pests, geographic distribution with respect to the exporting country and the United States, pest-host and pest-pathway associations, regulatory status of the pests, as determined by APHIS or other Federal Agencies, regulatory history, *i.e.*, interception records at U. S. ports-of-entry and selected references describing the biology of the pests.

Table 2: Pests of species of <i>Schlumbergera</i> and <i>Rhipsalidopsis</i>					
Pest	Geographic Distribution <sup>1</sup>	Plant Part Affected	Quarantine Pest	Follow Pathway	References
ARTHROPODA					
ACARI					
Tenuipalpidae					
<i>Brevipalpus russulus</i> (Boisduval)	EU, US	cladophyll	No	Yes	Jeppson <i>et al.</i> , 1975; Tuinbouw-Akkerbouw, 1979
Tetranychidae					
<i>Tetranychus urticae</i> Koch	EU, US	cladophyll	No	Yes	Baker and Tuttle, 1994; Tuinbouw-Akkerbouw, 1979
INSECTA					
HOMOPTERA					
Psuedococcidae					
<i>Pseudococcus obscurus</i> Essig	EU, US	cladophyll	No	Yes	McKenzie, 1967
<i>Rhizococcus cacticans</i> (Hambleton)	EU, US	roots	No	Yes	Scalenet, 1998
BACTERIA					
<i>Erwinia carotovora</i> (Jones) Bergey <i>et al.</i> (Gracilicutes; Enterobacteriaceae)	EU, US	cladophyll	No	Yes	Bradbury, 1986; Chase, 1987; Denmark, 2000; EPPO, 1994; Poole <i>et al.</i> , 1998
FUNGI					
<i>Bipolaris cactivora</i> (Petr.) Alcorn (Fungi Imperfecti: Hyphomycetes)	EU, US	cladophyll	No	Yes	ARS, 2003; Chase, 1987; Chase and Conover, 1998; CMI, 1990; Farr <i>et al.</i> , 1989; Goodey <i>et al.</i> , 1965
<i>Fusarium moniliforme</i> J. Sheld. (Fungi Imperfecti: Hyphomycetes)	EU, US	cladophyll	No	Yes	Farr <i>et al.</i> , 1989
<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlechtend. (Fungi Imperfecti: Hyphomycetes)	EU, US	cladophyll	No	Yes	Denmark, 2000; Farr <i>et al.</i> , 1989

Table 2: Pests of species of <i>Schlumbergera</i> and <i>Rhipsalidopsis</i>					
Pest	Geographic Distribution <sup>1</sup>	Plant Part Affected	Quarantine Pest	Follow Pathway	References
<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlechtend. f.sp. <i>opuntiarum</i> (Pettinari) Gordon (Fungi Imperfecti: Hyphomycetes)	NL	cladophyll	Yes	Yes	CABI, 1966; Miller, 1980; Moorman, 1998; O'Donnell, 2001; Poole <i>et al.</i> , 1998
<i>Phytophthora nicotianae</i> Breda de Haan. var. <i>parasitica</i> (Dastur) G. M. Waterhouse (Oomycetes: Peronosporales)	EU, US	cladophyll roots	No	Yes	Alfieri and Miller, 1977; Chase, 1997; Farr <i>et al.</i> , 1989; Moorman, 1998
<i>Pythium aphanidermatum</i> (Edson) Fitzp. (Oomycetes: Peronosporales)	EU, US	cladophyll roots	No	Yes	ARS, 2003; Chase, 1987; CMI, 1978; Farr <i>et al.</i> , 1989
<i>Pythium irregulare</i> Buisman (Oomycetes: Peronosporales)	EU, US	cladophyll roots	No	Yes	Chase, 1997; CMI, 1986; Farr <i>et al.</i> , 1989; Moorman, 1998
<i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> Kühn (Fungi imperfecti: Agonomycetes)	EU, US	roots, stems	No	Yes	Farr <i>et al.</i> , 1989
NEMATODA					
Heteroderidae					
<i>Cactodera cacti</i> (Filipjev & Schuurmans Stekhoven) Krall & Krall	EU, US	Roots	No	Yes	Chase, 1987; Evans <i>et al.</i> , 1993; Goodey <i>et al.</i> , 1965; Poole <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Society of Nematologists, 1984
<i>Meloidogyne arenaria</i> Chitwood	EU, US	Roots	No	Yes	Evans <i>et al.</i> , 1993; Society of Nematologists, 1984; Taylor and Sasser, 1978
<i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> Chitwood	EU, US	Roots	No	Yes	Evans <i>et al.</i> , 1993; Society of Nematologists, 1984; Taylor and Sasser, 1978
Tylenchulidae					



Table 2: Pests of species of <i>Schlumbergera</i> and <i>Rhipsalidopsis</i>					
Pest	Geographic Distribution <sup>1</sup>	Plant Part Affected	Quarantine Pest	Follow Pathway	References
<i>Pratylenchus vulnus</i> Allen & Jensen	EU, US	Roots	No	Yes	Goody <i>et al.</i> , 1965; Luc <i>et al.</i> , 1990; Society of Nematologists, 1984
VIRUSES					
Cactus X potexvirus =Zygocactus virus X (Potexvirus)	EU, US	Systemic	No	Yes	Brunt <i>et al.</i> , 2003; Chase, 1987
Impatiens necrotic spot virus = Tomato Spotted Wilt Virus- Impatiens strain (Bunyaviridae: Tospovirus)	EU, US	Systemic	No	Yes	Moorman, 1998; Tisserat, 1995

<sup>1</sup>Distribution: EU-Europe, NL-Netherlands, US-United States.

There is one pest listed in Table 2, *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *opuntiarum*, that may be considered a quarantine pest *sensu stricto* (FAO 2003). Current taxonomic classifications of *Fusarium oxysporum* recognize a number of *formae speciales* based on host range testing (Agrios, 1997; Baayen, *et al.*, 2000; Daughtrey *et al.*, 1995; Gerlach, 1972) and molecular techniques (Baayen, *et al.*, 2000; Gerlach, 1972). The *formae speciales* identified as *opuntiarum* in The Netherlands and Germany is not known to be present in the United States (O'Donnell, personal communication).

The organism *Fusarium oxysporum* occurs in the United States (Farr *et al.*, 1989), and diagnoses in production systems are not made at the *formae speciales* level (Chase 2001; Daughtrey *et al.*, 1995; Miller, 1980; Moorman, 1998). The characteristic above-ground symptoms of cladophyll rot are relatively easy to identify and treat in the greenhouse (Agrios, 1997; Chase, 1987, 2001; Miller, 1980; Moorman, 1998). Use of clean stock and phytosanitary greenhouse production programs provides effective control for *Fusarium* diseases (Chase, 2001). For these reasons, *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *opuntiarum* is not analyzed as a unique quarantine pest for the purposes of this document.

Several species of *Opuntia* are listed as threatened or endangered species in the United States (Title 50, Part 17 (50 CFR §17)) and it is unknown if the *F. oxysporum* f. sp. *opuntiarum* found in Europe can infect Threatened, Endangered or Candidate plant populations (O'Donnell, personal communication). *Fusarium* spp. can survive as dormant spores, which may remain undetected on the host plants (Agrios, 1997; Daughtrey *et al.*, 1995), whether bare-root or in media. For these reasons, importation of species of *Schlumbergera* and *Rhipsalidopsis* in growing media into the United States must meet the regulations that apply to plants in growing media (7 CFR §319.37-8). The use of these mitigation measures is expected to substantially reduce the Likelihood of Introduction, and as such, the overall pest risk potential would be rated low because the known pests effectively are removed from the pathway. Additionally, *Schlumbergera* must be artificially propagated and cannot be collected from the wild in

accordance with the CITES regulations (CITES, 1998).

### III. Phytosanitary Measures/Risk Management

There are special concerns associated with non-destructive inspections of propagative material established in growing media. For example, the presence of biological contaminants may not be discernable by visual inspection (this includes both pre-departure and port-of-entry inspections); the efficacy of treatment(s) of the growing media may not be discernable; pest infestation and/or re-infestation of “clean” plants may be undetected. The risks of importing propagative materials in growing media have been addressed by the USDA (Santacroce, 1991) and mitigated in regulations outlined in 7 CFR § 319.37-8.

In contrast, the characteristic above ground symptoms of cladophyll rot due to infection by *Fusarium* species are relatively easy to identify and treat (Agrios, 1997; Chase, 1987, 2001; Miller, 1980; Moorman, 1998). Control measures used in the United States for *Fusarium* generally do not rely on diagnoses confirmed at the *formae speciales* level (Chase, 2001; Daughtrey *et al.*, 1995; Miller, 1980; Moorman, 1998). In practice, diagnostic confirmation of the presence or absence of *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *opuntarium*, when a clean stock and greenhouse production program is in use, should not be necessary because effective mitigation measures control many *Fusarium* diseases (Chase, 2001).

The proposed importation of *Schlumbergera* and *Rhipsalidopsis* plants in APHIS-approved growing media and under greenhouse growing conditions, if approved, will be managed by existing regulations [7 CFR § 319.37-8]. The mitigation measures described comprise a “Systems Approach” designed to establish and maintain a pest-free production environment. The Plant Protection Act of 2000 (7 USC §§ 7701 *et seq.*) defines a “Systems Approach” as “...a defined set of phytosanitary procedures, at least two of which have an independent effect in mitigating pest risk associated with the movement of commodities.” 7 USC § 7702. The FAO Standard for Integrated Measures for Pest Risk Management definition of a Systems Approach is, “The integration of different pest risk management measures, at least two of which act independently, and which cumulatively achieve the desired level of phytosanitary protection.” (FAO, 2002). Pest risk management is one of the components (analysis, management, and communication) of the decision-making process of reducing the risk of introduction of a quarantine pest (FAO, 2002). These mitigations effectively remove the pests from the pathway prior to importation into the United States.

Systems Approaches are established by an importing country as an alternative to the use of single quarantine measures when a single phytosanitary measure is nonexistent, not feasible or undesirable. The combinations of specific mitigation measures that provide overlapping or sequential safeguards are distinctly different from single mitigation methodologies such as fumigation or inspection (Jang and Moffitt, 1994). Systems Approaches vary in complexity and are often tailored to specific commodity-pest-origin combinations (FAO, 2002). Options for specific measures may be selected from a range of pre-harvest and post-harvest measures, *e.g.*,

surveys, inspections, sanitation, chemical treatments, *etc.*; and include mitigation measures to compensate for uncertainty. PPQ uses systems approaches for the importation of many commodities including Unshu oranges from Japan (7 CFR § 319.28), tomatoes from Spain, France, Morocco, and Western Sahara (7 CFR § 319.56-2dd), peppers from Israel, and ferns from The Netherlands (7 CFR § 319.56-2u). These programs have performed successfully for many years as evidenced by the very low numbers of interceptions over the years the programs have been active.

The three main categories of mitigation measures specifically required by 7 CFR § 319.37-8 (e) for propagative materials are: use of pest-free propagative material, pest-exclusionary greenhouses and inspection. Ensuring pest-free propagative material requires monitoring and testing of mother stock and descendant plants (Agrios, 1997; Jarvis, 1992; Kahn, 1977) and the use of pest-free mother stock plants. The terms “stock plants” and “mother blocks” are used interchangeably when referring to plants which are grown in APHIS-approved media.

The use of clean mother stock is an essential component of ornamental plant production (Agrios, 1997; Bodman *et al.*, 1996; Jarvis, 1992; Jones and Benson, 2001; Metcalf and Metcalf, 1993; Mizell and Short, 1999). This requirement initially excludes pests from the plant production environment (Kahn and Mathur, 1999; Metcalf and Metcalf, 1993). Fungal pathogens introduced into the greenhouse via infested plant material can also be reduced or eliminated by clean mother stock (Jones and Benson, 2001).

Pest-exclusionary greenhouses employ treatments, good sanitation, *e.g.*, surface disinfection of tools and plant materials, *etc.* (Agrios, 1997; Barry, 1996; Bessin, 2001; Jarvis, 1992; Jones and Benson, 2001; Kahn and Mathur, 1999), clean water sources (Bodman *et al.*, 1996; Jarvis, 1992; Kahn and Mathur, 1999; Pirone, 1978; Van der Plank, 1963), and use of approved growing media. Sanitation is the general cleanliness and pathogen-free condition of the nursery operation, aimed at reducing the overall inoculum level in the nursery (Jones and Benson, 2001). Surface disinfection may be achieved with isopropyl alcohol, denatured ethyl alcohol, sodium hypochlorite, and calcium hypochlorite. Surface disinfection of bare roots is achieved by dipping in a solution of *n*-alkyl ammonium chloride prior to propagation. These solutions are most effective if used within 30 minutes of preparation (Jones and Benson, 2001). Studies on APHIS-approved growing media found that pathogens are not present (Santacroce, 1991). Approved growing media is defined in 7 CFR 319.37-8(e)(1) and 319.37-8(f)(3)(iv). Improper nursery practices, the primary means by which pathogens are introduced and spread in the nursery (Jones and Benson, 2001) are avoided by oversight and quality assurance required by USDA APHIS and captured in an operational workplan.

Pest management of ornamentals often includes chemical pest control (Osborne, *et. al.*, 2001). Chemical controls are supplemental and used in combination with other mitigation measures, such as pest exclusionary greenhouses (Reinert, 1981, Ghidui and Roberts, 2003). Physical pest control measures are effective mitigations in greenhouses. Such measures include washing with a hose and water and spraying inert soap sprays for aphids; spraying with horticultural oils for mealybugs, scale insects, and whiteflies; and physical removal and destruction for leafminers.

Well-water is the preferred source for irrigation, since well water is generally pathogen-free, while pond water is a major source of water mold pathogens. If water must be recirculated, a bromine treatment will eradicate plant-pathogenic bacteria (Jones and Benson, 2001).

The United States import restrictions barring soil carried with propagative horticultural plants effectively prevent the introduction of many mollusks (Robinson, 2002). Screens and doors exclude the entry of flying or crawling pests that cannot fit through screens (Bessin, 2001; Metcalf and Metcalf, 1993). The greenhouse enclosure provides a physical barrier to plants' exposure to rain splashed or windborne fungal spores (Agrios, 1997; Pirone, 1978; Barry, 1996).

The mitigations detailed above emphasize the use of pest free sources of growing media and pest free commodity proper. There are then several mitigations aimed at ensuring that the pest free status is maintained throughout the production process and along the transportation pathway. A series of inspections are also incorporated to assure quality control and phytosanitary rigor.

While not specifically required under 7 CFR § 319.37-8(e), standard industry practices help to further ensure that the pests of concern do not follow the pathway. These include sanitation and chemical treatments designed to reduce or eliminate insects (Bessin, 2001; Mizell and Short, 1998) and fungi (Jones and Benson, 2001), and *in vitro* or aseptic vegetative propagation (Hartman and Kester, 1959). Other cultural practices, such as proper lighting, nutrition, sanitation, temperature and watering, enhance plant vigor so that pests are less able to infest or infect mother stock (Bodman *et al.*, 1996; Jones and Benson, 2001; Kahn and Mathur, 1999).

Because of these potential biological hazards, mitigating factors for the importation of *Schlumbergera* and *Rhipsalidopsis* from The Netherlands must include those conditions specified in the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (7 CFR § 319.37-8). Concomitantly, *Schlumbergera* must be artificially propagated and cannot be collected from the wild in accordance with CITES regulations (CITES, 1998). The peak season of production for *Schlumbergera* is expected to be November to December and for *Rhipsalidopsis* is February to March (Anon., 2002). These seasons do not correspond to active outdoor growing seasons for Cactaceae in much of the United States which further reduces any risks of pathogen establishment if this *formae specialis* were to enter the country. The use of all these mitigation measures is expected to substantially reduce the Likelihood of Introduction, and as such, the overall pest risk potential would be rated low because the known pests are effectively removed the from the pathway.

#### IV. Literature Cited

- Agrios, G. N. 1997. Plant Pathology. 4th Edition. Academic Press. NY.
- Alfieri, Jr. S. A., and J. W. Miller. 1977. Christmas Cactus: Basal Stem and Root Rot. Plant Pathology Circular No. 174. Florida. Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services, Division of Plant Industry. [www.ifas.ufl.edu/~apkweb/fdacs/Cir174.htm](http://www.ifas.ufl.edu/~apkweb/fdacs/Cir174.htm)
- Anon. 2002. Flora Dania. [www.floradania.dk](http://www.floradania.dk)
- ARS. 2003. United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service Fungal Database. Systematic Mycology and Botany Laboratory. Beltsville, MD. <http://nt.ars-grin.gov/fungalatabases/databaseframe.cfm>
- Baayen, R. P., O'Donnell, K., Bonants, P. J. M., Cigelnik, E., Kroon, L. P. N. M., Roebroeck, E. J. A., and C. Waalwijk. 2000. Gene genealogies and AFLP analyses in the *Fusarium oxysporum* complex identify monophyletic and nonmonophyletic formae speciales causing wilt and rot disease. Phytopathol. 90: 891-900.
- Baker, W. W. and D. M. Tuttle. 1994. A Guide To The Spider Mites (Tetranychidae) Of The United States. Indira Publishing House, Michigan.
- Barry, D. W. (ed.) 1996. Greenhouse Pesticide Management. Section 10 – Management of Greenhouse Diseases <<http://www.ag.ndsu.nodak.edu/aginfo>>.
- Bessin, 2001. Controls for greenhouse ornamental insect pests. Univ. Kentucky Coop. Ext. Service <<http://www.uky.edu/Agriculture/Entomology/entfacts>>.
- Bodman, K.; Carson, C.; Forsberg, L.; Gough, N.; Hughes, I.; Parker, R.; Ramsey, M. and M. Waterhouse. 1996. Ornamental Plants. Dept. Primary Industries, Info. Series QI 96001, Australia.
- Bradbury, J. F. 1986. Guide to Plant Pathogenic Bacteria. CAB International Mycological Institute.
- Brunt, A. A., Crabtree, K., Dallwitz, M. J., Gibbs, A. J., Watson, L. and E. J. Zurcher (eds). 2003. Plant Viruses Online: Descriptions and Lists from the VIDE Database. <http://biology.anu.edu.au/Groups/MES/vide/>
- CABI. 1966. CAB Index of Fungi. 3(12): 354.
- Chase, A. R. 1987. Compendium of Ornamental Foliage Plant Diseases. American

Phytopathological Society, St. Paul, MN.

Chase, A. R. 1997. Foliage Plant Diseases: Diagnosis and Control. American Phytopathological Society, St. Paul, MN.

Chase, A. R. 2001. Diseases of Cacti and Succulents. Chase Research Gardens, Inc.  
<http://www.hortworld.com/cacti.htm>

Chase, A.R. and C. A. Conover. 1998. Using Temperature Information to Aid in Controlling Disease in Ornamentals. Central Florida Research and Education Center. Apopka FL.  
[http://www.ifas.ufl.edu/~apkweb/cfrec/rh\\_91\\_8.htm](http://www.ifas.ufl.edu/~apkweb/cfrec/rh_91_8.htm)

CIE. 1957. Distribution Maps of Pests. Map No. 73. *Orthezia insignis* Browne. Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, UK.

CITES. 1998. Convention on International Trade In Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna. <http://www.wcmc.org.uk/CITES/english/index.html>

CMI. 1978. Distribution Maps of Plant Diseases No. 309 *Pythium aphanidermatum* (Edson) Fitzp.. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, UK.

CMI. 1986. Distribution Maps of Plant Diseases No. 206. *Pythium irregulare* Buismane Commonwealth Mycological Institute, UK.

CMI. 1990. Description of Fungi and Bacteria No. 1008. *Drechslera cactivora* (Petrak). M. B. Ellis. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, UK.

Daughtrey, M. L., Wick, R. L., and J. L. Peterson. 1995. Compendium of Flowering Potted Plant Diseases. American Phytopathology Society, St. Paul, MN.

Denmark. 2000. Official Danish Pest list and production information received from Dansk Erhvervsgartnerforening.

Evans, K., Trudgill, D. L. and J. M. Webster. 1993. Plant Parasitic Nematodes in Temperate Agriculture. CAB International, Wallingford, UK.

EPPO. 1994. European and Mediterranean Plant Organization (EPPO) Plant Quarantine Retrieval System, Version 3.0. CAB International, Wallingford, UK.

FAO. 2002. International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures. Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms, Publication No. 5. Rome, Italy.

FAO. 2003. International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures. Pest Risk Analysis for Quarantine Pests Including Analysis of Environmental Risks, Publication No. 11. Rome, Italy.

Farr, D. F., Bills, G. F., Chamuris, G. P. and A. Y. Rossman. 1989. Fungi On Plants And Plant Products in the United States. American Phytopathological Society, St. Paul, MN.

Gerlach, W. 1972. *Fusarium*-Fäule und andere pilzliche Krankheiten gärtnerisch wichtiger akteen in Deutschland. Phytopath. Z. 74: 197-217.

Ghidiu, G. M. and W. J. Roberts. 2003. Greenhouse Screening for Insect Control, Factsheet FS640. The State University of New Jersey, Rutgers Cooperative Extension. [www.rce.rutgers.edu/pubs/pdfs/fs640.pdf](http://www.rce.rutgers.edu/pubs/pdfs/fs640.pdf).

Goodey, T., Goodey, B. J., Franklin, M. T. and D. J. Hooper. 1965. The Nematode Parasites of Plants Cataloged Under Their Hosts, 3rd Edition. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.

Gunn, C. R. and C. Ritchie. 1982. Report of the Technical Committee to Evaluate Noxious Weeds; Exotic Weeds for Federal Noxious Weed Act.

Hartmann, H. T. and D. E. Kester. 1959. Plant Propagation, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Prentice-Hall, Inc., NJ.

Holm, L. G., Plucknett, D. L., Pancho., J. V. and J. P. Herberger. 1977. The World's Worst Weeds. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu.

Holm, L. G., Pancho., J. V., Herberger, J. P. and D. L. Plucknett. 1979. A Geographical Atlas of World Weeds. John Wiley and Sons, New York, NY.

Holm, L. G., Doll, J., Holm, E., Pancho, J. and J. Herberger. 1997. World Weeds: Natural Histories and Distribution. J. Wiley and Sons, New York, NY.

Jang, E. B. and H. R. Moffitt. 1994. Systems approaches to achieving quarantine security. *In*: Quarantine treatments for pests on food plants. Westview Press pp. 225-237.

Jarvis, W. R. 1992. Managing Diseases in Greenhouse Crops. American Phytopathology Society, St. Paul, MN. 288pp.

Jeppson, R. L., Hartford, H. K. and E. B. Baker. 1975. Mites Injurious To Economic Plants. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Jones, R. K. and D. M. Benson. 2001. Diseases of Woody Ornamentals and Trees in Nurseries. APS Press.

Kahn, R.P. 1977. Plant quarantine: Principles, methodology, and suggested approaches. *In*:

Kahn, R. P. and S. B. Mathur. 1999. Containment Facilities and Safeguards. Am. Phytopathol. Soc., MN.

Luc, M., Sikora, R.A. and J. Bridge. 1990. Plant Parasitic Nematodes in Subtropical and Tropical Agriculture. CAB International. Institute of Parasitology. Cambrian Printers Ltd. Aberystwyth, U.K.

McKenzie, H. L. 1967. Mealybugs of California. With Taxonomy, Biology and Control of North American Species (Homoptera: Coccoidea: Pseudococcidae). University of California Press, Berkeley.

Metcalf, R. L. and R. A. Metcalf. 1993. Destructive and Useful Insects, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. McGraw-Hill, Inc., NY.

Miller, J. W. 1980. Fusarium Blight and Leaf Spot Of Christmas Cactus. Plant Pathology Circular No. 220. Florida. Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services, Division of Plant Industry. [www.ifas.ufl.edu/~apkweb/fdacs/Cir220.htm](http://www.ifas.ufl.edu/~apkweb/fdacs/Cir220.htm)

Mizell, R. F. and Short, D.E. 1999. Integrated pest management in the commercial ornamental nursery, 1999 Insect Management Guide. Univ. Florida, FL Coop. Ext. Service  
<<http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu>>.

Moorman, G. W. 1998. Plant Disease Facts. Christmas Cactus Diseases. Cooperative extension- The Pennsylvania State University. [ww.cas.psu.edu/docs/CASDEPT/PLANT/ext/xmascact.html](http://www.cas.psu.edu/docs/CASDEPT/PLANT/ext/xmascact.html)

O'Donnell, K. 2001. Personal communication.

Osborne, L. S., Buss, E. A. Mannion, C. M. and J. F. Price. 2001. Commercial Foliage and Woody Ornamental Arthropod Pest Management. University of Florida Cooperative Extension Service, document ENY-311. <<http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu>>.

Petersen, L. 2002. Personal communication. Danish Assoc. Hortic. Producers. Subject: Export of *Schlumbergera* (Christmas Cactus), established in growing media, to U.S.A.

Pirone, P. P. 1978. Diseases and Pests of Ornamental Plants, 5th ed. John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Poole, R. T., Osborne, L.S. and A. R. Chase. 1998. Holiday Cactus Production Guide. University of Florida. Central Florida Research and Education Center, Apopka, FL.  
[www.ifas.ufl.edu/~apkweb/folnotes/holiday.htm](http://www.ifas.ufl.edu/~apkweb/folnotes/holiday.htm)

Reed, C. F. 1977. Economically Important Foreign Weeds. Agric. Handbook No. 498. United States Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service/ Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Washington, DC.



Reinert, J. A. 1981. Evaluation of Miticides for Control of *Paracalacarus podocarpus* on *Podocarpus*. Journal of Economic Entomology 74: 85 - 87.

Robinson, D. 2002. USDA, APHIS, National Malacology Specialist. 2002. E-mail communication with M. Hennessey, April 2, 2002.

Santacroce, N. G. 1991. An Evaluation of Pests Associated With Packaged Peat, Rockwool and Expanded Clay and Their Association With Media in Greenhouse Production. USDA, APHIS, PPQ, Riverdale MD.

Scalenet. 1998. Miller, D. Ben Dov, Y and Gibson G., Biological and Systematic Information System (BASIS). <http://www.sel.barc.usda.gov/scalenet/scalenet.htm>

Society of Nematologists. 1984. Distribution of Plant-Parasitic Nematode Species in North America. A Project of the Nematode Geographical Distribution Committee of the Society Of Nematologists.

Taylor, A. L. and J. N. Sasser. 1978. Biology Identification and Control of Root-Knot Nematodes (*Meloidogyne* Species). International *Meloidogyne* Project. North Carolina State University, Raleigh.

Tisserat, N. 1995. Impatiens Necrotic Spot (INSV) and Tomato Spotted Wilt (TSWV). Cooperative Extension Service Kansas State University. <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/biology/organism/orn1.htm>

Tuinbouw-Akkerbouw, G. O.. 1979 Gids Voor Ziekten-en Oekruiddbestrijding in Land. Ministerie Van landbouw en Visserij, Wageningen.

USDA. 2000. Pathway-Initiated Pest Risk Assessment: Guidelines for Qualitative Assessments, ver. 5.02.

Van der Plank, J. E. 1963. Plant Diseases: Epidemics and Control. Academic Press, NY.

WSSA. 2003. Composite List of Weeds. Weed Science Society of America.